

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/829,080

Applicant(s)

INGRAM, TODD RUSSELL

Examiner

PAUL T. CHIN

Art Unit

3652

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) PAUL T. CHIN.

(3) Todd R. Ingram.

(2) Donald Townsend, Jr.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 23 October 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: applicant demonstrates by frictionally gripping of a log with a unary, v-sahped flexible open-jawed mouth.

Claim(s) discussed: 7.

Identification of prior art discussed: Thomas.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: the differences between the detailed structure of an open-jawed mount of the instant application and the detailed open jaw structure of Thomas have been discussed. Thomas shows an open jaw mouth having an open end and a closed end defining an outer perimeter, and a lower end of an elongated connecting rod is being connected to a middle portion of the outer perimeter of the close end wherein the instant application shows an open jaw mouth having an open end defining an inner perimeter and a closed end defining an outer perimeter, the inner perimeter comprising a first straight portion having a first end and a second end, a curved portion having a first end and a second end, and a second straight portion having a first end and a second end wherein the second end of the second straight portion is being connected to a lower end of the elongated connecting rod. Applicant provides the proposed claim 7 which includes a new issue, "friction ridges disposed on the first straight portion from the first end to the second end thereof, and on the second straight portion from the first end to the second end thereof". The proposed claim 7 in combination with the structural limitation of "the second end of the second straight portion of being connected to a lower end of the elongated connecting rod" appears to overcome the prior art of record. However, the proposed claims raise new issues that would require further search and reconsideration of the prior art of record.